

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/041,022	01/07/2002	Asok K. Perumainar	P7213	2620
32658 7:	590 03/24/2006		EXAMINER	
HOGAN & HARTSON LLP			MOSSER, KATHLEEN MICHELE	
ONE TABOR (CENTER, SUITE 1500 EEN ST.		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
DENVER, CO 80202			3715	

DATE MAILED: 03/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

(M
γU

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/041,022	PERUMAINAR, ASOK K.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Kathleen Mosser	3715				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	l. ely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
•	' <u> </u>					
•	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4) □ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) □ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers						
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on <u>07 January 2002</u> is/are: Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	a) \square accepted or b) \square objected drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is object.	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive ı (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 02/01/02.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:					

DETAILED ACTION

Page 2

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 1. Claims 1-6 and 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gardner et al (US 5239617). Gardner et al teaches a method including: providing an interpreter interface including a code entry portion adapted for receiving input from a user (user interface 26); receiving a single code entry from the user via the code entry portion (the user inputs a command, see col. 4: 66-68); processing the code entry and in response to the processing, displaying a visual cue to the user (col. 5: 1-13), as in claim 1 and the computer program product of claim 11. The processing including comparing syntax of the code entry to a set of syntax rules for the programming language to identify a syntax error or validity of the code entry syntax (claim 2) is taught in at least col. 5: 22-24. Regarding claims 3-5,12 and 13 the steps of determining an "error code", displaying the error code, and keeping an error history is shown in at least col. 9: 1 col. 12:15, where a working example of the method is shown. When no error is determined the command is executed (claims 6 and 14), as is shown in col. 5: 1-3.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 3715

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 2. Claims 1, 6-10, 11, and 14-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al (US 5204960) in view of Mizumoto et al (US 6550056). Smith et al teaches a computer program product, system and method for its use including: means for receiving a code entry from a user (receipt source file from the user, Figure 2, step 200); and a syntax validation processing the received code entry based on syntax rules for the programming language to determine syntax validity or a syntax error (col. 5: 39-40 and the inherent nature of how compilers work, as in claims 1, 11 and 16. During compilation of a program the system determines whether the proper syntax has been used for the entirety of the program), as in claims 6, 14 and 16. An execution engine (claim 19) is shown in Figure 6 element 508.

Smith et al fails to explicitly teach the use of a semantic view engine displaying a semantic view to the user based on the determined syntax validity or the syntax error (claim 16); that the display includes effects of the executing of the code entry (claims 7 and 15), including type, name and value of a variable (claims 8 and 18) or objects (claim 9) and arrays (claim 10), the error statement associated with the syntax error (claims 17 and 20). Mizumoto et al teaches a debugger program for use with program compilers (like that of Smith) including a user interface unit for entry of commands and codes (claim 20), see Figures 1 and 8; this unit includes the semantic view which displays the state of all variables including the above information, see Figures 3(a—c) and col. 8: 66- col.9: 6. At least Figures 13 and 14 show a display window with a series of entered command or code lines. It would have been obvious to

Application/Control Number: 10/041,022

Art Unit: 3715

implement the debugger of Mizumoto et al with the compiler of Smith et al so as to allow the user of the

Page 4

Smith et al invention to debug and properly correct programming errors within their intended program.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

a. Rouquie (US 5274821) teaches an interpreter type program

b. Ohta (US 5697788) teaches a system for teaching programming algorithms

c. Shulman et al (US 6311323) teaches a system and method for assisting a user in coding

a program

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should

be directed to Kathleen Mosser whose telephone number is (571) 272-4435. The examiner can normally

be reached on M-F 8:00-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

Monica Carter can be reached on (571) 272-4475. The fax phone number for the organization where this

application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application

Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from

either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through

Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC)

at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kathleen Mosser Primary Examiner

Art Unit 3715

March 20, 2006